



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

literal "day after tomorrow" as critics have hitherto done. Allowing, for the sake of the argument, that the Walpurgisnacht scene is in its proper place, the interpretation of "übermorgen" cannot be strictly literal since that would make it necessary for the incidents in the scenes 'Auerbachs Keller,' 'Hexenküche,' 'Strasse,' 'Abend,' 'Spaziergang,' in all the love scenes; namely 'Der Nachbarin Haus,' 'Strasse,' 'Garten,' 'Ein Gartenhäuschen,' 'Wald und Höhle,' 'Gretchens Stube,' and 'Marthens Garten;' in 'Am Brunnen,' 'Zwinger,' and the Valentin scene 'Nacht;' all to come between the day before Easter and the day before the first of May, which is impossible. The impossibility of a literal interpretation justifies one in suggesting any plausible explanation. It is not inconceivable that the word may have an indefinite future meaning, although I have been unable to find any other instances of such use.

However, even if this involved considerable violence to the legitimate meaning, as it does not, it is much easier to presume such a licence than to feel, with Thomas (p. lxxv), that to the questions of chronology "there is no answer that is altogether creditable to Goethe's poetic conscience;" to think that in writing the Walpurgisnacht scene Goethe

"simply gave the rein to his present humor, with no serious concern about the inner or outward harmony of what he was now writing, with the love tragedy he had written a quarter of a century before" (p. lxxv);

and to believe that "The result, as we have it, is undeniably a blemish in the poem" (p. lxxv). It is incredible that Goethe would have been careless enough to place the Walpurgisnacht after Dom when it came before it in time (p. lxxv, note).

Thomas's excuses for Goethe insertion of the scene (p. lxxvi), imply that Goethe carelessly introduced "a discordant passage into the pathos of his love tragedy;" that he was unsuccessful in making Faust appear a 'good man,' really making him only detestable and knowing it was not possible to "save the dignity or consistency of his character, he felt it was not worth while to "trouble about matters of time and space and quotidian probability" (p. lxxvii). These excuses are worse for our conception of Goethe as a liter-

ary artist than the blame Thomas chooses to give.

With the emendation of locating the Walpurgisnacht in the chronology of the drama one year after the first scene, all is made clear and plain, and there is no confusion. And this change involves only the translating by an unusual, although possible, meaning, a word which cannot be literally interpreted, as against the alternative of adjudging Goethe guilty of carelessly making a hopeless jumble of his *Faust*.

CLYDE B. FURST.

*Johns Hopkins University.*

### ENGLISH DRAMA.

*Das Wortspiel bei Shakspeare*, von LEOPOLD WURTH. Wien und Leipzig: W. Braumüller, 1895. 8vo, pp. xiv, 255. [*Wiener Beiträge zur englischen Philologie. I.*]

THERE is such an immense variety of plays upon words in the works of Shakspeare that it seems almost impossible to adopt a classification which will include all the instances of their occurrence. Yet this is what Dr. Wurth, in the work before us, has attempted to do. The book consists of two hundred and thirty-two pages, exclusive of preface and index, and of these pages one hundred and thirty-two are taken up with the grouping of only typical examples in their various classifications. The remaining pages are devoted to an introduction, consisting of eighteen pages, and to a discussion of Shakspeare's relation to his predecessors and contemporaries in their use of the play on words.

In the introduction, after briefly treating of the figure as a work of literary art (*Sprachkunst*), he gives a short history of its treatment by previous writers, and then proceeds to his own definition and classification.

"The play upon words arises," he says, "from that combination of two or more words, which have the same or a similar sound, but often quite different meanings, that not only a play on the sounds follows, but also one on the sense."

For the operation of this play upon words, it is necessary that the elements be no mere isolated words, but that they appear in combination: 1. with one another for the purpose

of the play; 2. with other words for the formation of the sentence; 3. as parts of an artistic whole with 1 and 2. Every word has to be considered in reference to its sound, its meaning, and its written form.

There are two general classes under which all the examples are grouped: plays on words which are due to a double meaning, and the plays merely on sound (*die Laut- oder Klangspiele*). The term for the latter group Dr. Wurth gives as *puns, punnings*. Under the former of these classes there are five divisions, and these again are further subdivided. The five are as follows: 1. a word is used with a double meaning by *one* person, and only *once*; 2. A word with a double meaning is used twice and oftener; this may be taken up by another person in the dramatic dialogue, or the word may be used several times by *one* person; 3. the double meaning may be brought out by the order of the words or the construction of the sentence. The two remaining divisions include all cases that do not belong to the three just mentioned, 4. dealing with riddle-plays, antimetabole, etc., and 5. treating of groups of plays, considered under the plays upon sound.

The plays on sound, constituting Dr. Wurth's second grand category of the play on words, are called Puns, and Punnings. The former of these terms Dr. Wurth uses to denote the plays on words with the same or similar sound, though, as he says,<sup>1</sup> "Es zuweilen auch für andere Arten gebraucht wird;" the latter denotes those plays which depend on a mere resemblance of sound. I hardly think one can find fault with this limitation in the use of the word "pun," for in the popular estimation, the idea, suggested by the word is almost invariably the play on two different words of similar sound, and not the play on the various meanings of one word.

There are four subdivisions of this class: the proper plays on words, the improper plays on words, the *figura etymologica*, etc., and the group-plays.

The proper plays on words include all cases which involve a similarity of sound, and at the same time affect the sense of the passage. The

improper plays on words, on the other hand, have no reference to the sense, but owe their existence merely to the delight which the author has in the repetition of the sound. Such are the effects of rime, assonance, alliteration, etc.

The *figura etymologica* includes those plays on words of the same stem but of different inflection, composition, etc. To this group also belong all the specimens of the second class above, that involve the sense of the words played upon. The fourth group—*die Grup-penspiele*—includes those cases where a word admits of a great variety of meanings, with perhaps slight changes in pronunciation, as in the play on *die, ace, ass*, in *M. N. D.*, v. 1. 311-317. The most interesting specimens of this class are what Dr. Wurth calls *Cyklonen-spiele*. The best illustration is in the dialogue between the second commoner and Marcellus in *J. C.*, i. 1. 10-30, where occur the plays on *cobbler, soles, mend, all*.

This brief outline gives a general idea of the extent of Dr. Wurth's system of classification; the care which he has taken in distinguishing closely related categories can only be seen by a careful study of his work. The author is hardly ever led away in his search for plays upon words to find them where they do not exist. Shakspeare uses this species of wit with such infinite variety that we have to be more careful in denying the existence of the play than in claiming it. Hence it is doubtful if it would be proper to deny the play in *A and C.*, i. 2. 51; Iras says to Charmian: "Go, you wild bedfellow, you cannot soothsay." Dr. Wurth remarks: "Hier ist es zweifelhaft, ob *Irás* meint, *Charmsan* sei ihre Bettgenossin, oder die einer andern Person." It flows so glibly from Iras's mouth that we do not suspect any reflection on Charmian, and at first sight we might deny the existence of the jest.

In the second section of this work, the author deals with the relation of Shakspeare to his predecessors and contemporaries in the use of the play upon words. Special attention is devoted to the influence of Euphuism and Lyly's dramatic style on Shakspeare. The author is unaware of the existence of the monograph by Dr. C. G. Child, entitled *John*

<sup>1</sup> P. 105, note.

*Lily and Euphuism.*<sup>2</sup> Dr. Child's work is too important a publication on the subject of Euphuism to be missing from the bibliography of anyone making a study of the influence of Lyly on the literature of the period.

The trend of criticism has been unfavorable to Shakspeare in his almost reckless use of the word-play. Dr. Wurth cites the opinions of various critics, who show their disapproval of his unbridled freedom; he thinks the critics are to blame, not Shakspeare. These plays upon words were, he says, "ein abglanz seiner Zeit." But the fact remains, that what is characteristic of, and pleasing to, a particular period, is not necessarily bound to give satisfaction to all ages, and thereby fulfil the highest conditions of literary art. Its justification, however, lies in its peculiar value as an element of dramatic characterization.

Dr. Wurth now puts the question whether Euphuism or some other fashion of speech, prevailing at that time, induced our poet to employ this figure. The distinguishing characteristics of Euphuism, according to Landmann, are "parisonic antithesis," and a peculiar kind of alliteration. Besides these, Landmann mentions "playing upon words, and the use of syllables sounding alike." If we adopt Dr. Child's scheme, which is fuller than Landmann's, we shall present more conclusively Dr. Wurth's contention. The devices depending upon sound likeness are: I. *a.* complete syllabic likeness, that is consonance, sometimes combined with alliteration; *b.* complete word-likeness, that is repetition; *c.* partial syllabic and word-likeness:—1. assonance; 2. rime; 3. annomination. II. alliteration. It is easy to see how readily the play upon words could be developed from these elements. Antithesis and alliteration would operate strongly in developing the incipient conceit.

To the question whether Lyly's *Euphues* had a distinct influence on Shakspeare, Dr. Wurth, following in part the "parallels" of W. L. Rushton, answers in the affirmative. The influence may be conscious, as in the parody in *I. Henry IV*, II. 4, 441 ff., or unconscious, as among others, the passage, *R and J*, III. 5. 119 f., but it nevertheless exists.

<sup>2</sup> *Münchener Beiträge z. Rom. u. Eng. Philologie*, Heft vii (1894).

To say that this is the influence of *Euphues*, except in the above-mentioned parody, is to attribute to Lyly the sole possession of the characteristics of Euphuism. The antithetical construction and all the various species of alliteration were found in the predecessors of Lyly; and Shakspeare is following his literary traditions when he writes *Lucr.*, 879: "Whoever plots the sin, thou point'st the season;" he does not necessarily show the influence of Lyly, but rather that of his time. To quote Dr. Child: 3

"Euphuism is a matter of diction, of form, of style, and nowhere in Shakspeare do we find a Euphuistic diction, save in the single instance where Euphuism appears to be parodied. In brief, it is possible that Euphuism may have exercised some formative influence upon Shakspeare in his youth, but it, at least, gave no distinctive quality to his style."

Sidney's *Arcadia* appeared in 1590, and succeeded in supplanting Euphuism. The more extensive use of the play upon words in this work merely indicates the development to a fuller growth of the germ of the earlier writers; it is hardly necessary to suppose that it has a direct influence on Shakspeare. Certainly Dr. Wurth is not justified in considering *M.N.D.*, v. 311, "Now die, die, die, die, die," as a satire on the following passage of the *Arcadia*: "End, then evil-destined Dorus, end: and end, thou woeful letter, end:"

Dr. Wurth now considers the influence of Lyly's dramatic style on Shakspeare. The prose of his dramas, says Dr. Wurth, has hardly any connection with that of the *Euphues*.<sup>4</sup> That this is not so is proved by Dr. Child, who, examining the prose dramas separately, says: 5

"The Euphuism of the plays is in a word a simplified Euphuism. The use of balanced parallelism and antithesis is of course everywhere preserved—but the balanced members are uniformly shorter, and the parisonic form is by no means so frequent . . . Euphonic alliteration is by no means so common as in the *Euphues*, and its use for emphasis in conjunction with parisonic balance is not only less frequent but less noticeable. . . . In a word,

3 P. 112.

4 P. 173: "Wie geziert und erkünstelt diese Prosa aber auch ist, mit dem Euphuismus hat sie so gut wie nichts gemein."

5 P. 88.

even where the dialogue takes the most sententious form, the natural necessity for directness and movement obliges Lyly, even though he succeeds in preserving what is essentially a Euphuistic tone, to forego many of the elaborate and sophisticated graces which mark his style in the *Euphues*."

To show how essentially Shakspeare was Lyly's pupil, Dr. Wurth quotes instances of Lyly's use of the play upon words from his plays, and compares with them passages from Shakspeare. It is hardly to be doubted that the bright wit of this dialogue exercised considerable influence in establishing the play upon words as a popular species of fun, and revealed to Shakspeare the possibilities for this form of amusement which he developed to such a great extent in his plays.

The great popularity of the figure is shown by our author in the numerous jest-books of the period, and in the popular songs and ballads.

The last chapter of this book deals with the play upon words as a means in the art of characterization. It may be used as: (a) a means of humorous representation; (b) a means of tragic expression; and (c) a means for depicting a situation. To the first class belongs the talk of the fools and clowns, to the second such a play upon words as Gaunt makes on his name when dying, and to the third the affected conversation of the two Gentlemen of Verona, who reflect by this means the tone of the court.

The play upon words is sometimes useful in deciding a question of text. Thus in *Coriol.*, i, 1, 166 f. occurs the passage: "Rome and rats are at the point of battle; the one side must have *bale*." The folio reads *baile*. Theobald emended to *bale*, and in this he has been followed by all except Hanmer, who reads *bane*. This is the reading Dr. Wurth accepts, because it corresponds better with *rats*, "ratsbane" being their usual poison. Cf. *M. for M.*, i, 2. 123: "Like *rats* that ravin down their proper *bane*," which seems to confirm this reading. The change from *bane* to *baile* is, of course, easy as far as the mere form is concerned.

JAS. W. TUPPER.

Philadelphia.

## GOETHE.

*Goethe im Sturm und Drang* von RICHARD WEISSENFELS. Erster Band. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1894. 8vo, pp. xiv, 519.

FOR some time Goethe-philology seemed doomed to deal only with the details of Goethe's life and literary productions, and to neglect the great forces of which he was an expression. The recent appearance of works like Bielschowsky's and Meyer's biographies, and of the book before us, prove that the appreciation of Goethe as the powerful representative of a great age is not dead, and that the vast labor expended on the study of Goethe since Lewes' time is bearing fruit. Weissenfels' work, of which the first volume only has so far appeared, must be regarded as abreast with the best recently published on Goethe.

The purpose of the book is to lay bare the forces which moulded Goethe during his childhood and early manhood, and to show how he in turn influenced his nation by his early publications. Special attention is paid to his moral and intellectual condition during the Storm and Stress period as a most important epoch of his life. Two elements distinguish the book: skill and tact in the use of much valuable material, hitherto generally neglected, and an admirable method of presentation. We are made thoroughly to appreciate, on the one hand, Goethe's moral and intellectual organism, his inherited instincts, and, on the other, his environment, the influences from without at work upon him. Weissenfels is skilful enough to avoid becoming mechanical. His presentation is vigorous and throbs with life to the last. The book is modern in the best sense of the word. Weissenfels shows how in Goethe's father and mother were personified the two elements which struggled for the supremacy during a large part of the eighteenth century: in his father, the *Aufklärung* which suppressed feeling and the imagination, and in his mother, Storm and Stress forces which in time were to gain the ascendancy in Germany. Like most Goethe biographers, with the exception of Max Koch, Weissenfels judges Rath Goethe too severely. He doubtless was an *Aufklär-*